arXiv:quant-ph/0112158v2 4 Jul 2002

Quantum Finance: The Finite Dimensional Case *

Zeqian Chen

Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Sciences

30 West District, Xiao-Hong Mountain, Wuhan

P.O.Box 71010, Wuhan 430071; China

E-mail: zqchen@wipm.ac.cn

Abstract. In this paper, we present a quantum version of some portions of Mathematical Finance, including theory of arbitrage, asset pricing, and optional decomposition in financial markets based on finite dimensional quantum probability spaces. As examples, the quantum model of binomial markets is studied. We show that this quantum model ceases to pose the paradox which appears in the classical model of the binomial market. Furthermore, we re-deduce the Cox-Ross-Rubinstein binomial option pricing formula by considering multi-period quantum binomial markets.

Key words and phrases: Selfadjoint operators, non-commutative stochastic biprocesses, quantum financial markets, martingale (risk-neutral) states, Pauli spin matrices, the binomial model, the Cox-Ross-Rubinstein binomial option pricing formula.

Running Title: Quantum Finance

Contents

0. Introduction
1. Notational preliminaries
2. Non-commutative martingales and arbitrage-free
3. Pricing by no-arbitrage and optimal decomposition
4. Quantum binomial models
5. Conclusions

*Journal of Economic Literature Index Numbers: G10, G12

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 46L53, 91B28

This paper was partly written when the author visited Equipe de Mathématiques, Université de Franche-Comté, supported by the grant of the academic cooperation agreement between CAS and CNRS. He would like to thank the Equipe de Mathématiques for its kind hospitality. In particular, he is very grateful to Professor Q.Xu for conversations on non-commutative probability.

0. Introduction

Perhaps the most dramatic shift in our understanding of the physical real-world occurred in 1925, when Heisenberg published a remarkable paper in which he demonstrated that one could deduce quantum phenomena from the equations of Newtonian physics provided one interpreted the time dependent variables as standing for matrices rather than functions. In contrast to functions, matrices need not commute under multiplication. Heisenberg's "matrix mechanics" quickly attracted the attention of a number of leading mathematicians, including Jordan, von Neumann, and Weyl. In particular, von Neumann pointed out that Heisenberg's matrices were more precisely modelled by self-adjoint Hilbert space operators. There is now a consensus among scientists that the classical and relativistic notions of measurement and geometry that underlie so much of modern mathematics no longer correspond to our understanding of the real world. Von Neumann was the first to fully appreciate this fact, and he concluded that we should seek "quantized" (= non-commutative) analogues of mathematics. He proposed that, as in physics, we should begin by replacing functions by operators [vN55]. During the past sixty years, such "non-commutative" mathematics have been shown to have a profound structure theory. For details see for example [Co94], [My93], [P92], [Ta01], and references therein.

In this paper we try to concern with a more recent innovation, the *quantization of Mathematical Finance.* There are several reasons why quantizing mathematical finance may be interesting. First, classical mathematical finance theory is a well established discipline of applied mathematics (see [EK99] and [Sh99] for example) which has found numerous applications in financial markets (see for example [CR85], [Du93], [Hu00], and [Me90]). Since it is based on probability to a large extend, there is a fundamental interest in generalizing this theory to the domain of quantum probabilities. Indeed, recently non-commutative (= quantum) probability theory has developed considerably. In particular, all sorts of non-commutative analogues of Brownian motion and martingales have been studied. We refer to [My93], [P92], [PX97], and references therein. Second, if the "Selfish Genes" [Da76] are reality, we may speculate that stock markets of human beings are being played already on the molecular level where quantum mechanics dictates the rules. Third, there is an intimate connection between the theory of finance and the theory of quantum games ([My99] and [EWL99]). Indeed, if one buys 100 shares of IBM stock, he may think that he has made an investment. Ignoring the broker's fees, he plays a zero-sum game with the seller. If the price goes up, he will win and the seller will lose; if the price goes down, he will lose and the seller will win. One of them is going to profit at the other's expense. It has recently been shown that quantum strategies can be more successful than classical ones ([My99], [EWL99] and [EM00]). Finally, the quantum version of financial markets is maybe much more suited to real-world financial markets rather than the classical one, because the quantum binomial model ceases to pose the paradox which appears in the classical model of the binomial market as shown in [Ch2] (see also §4 below).

In retrospect, the field of mathematical finance has undergone a remarkable development since the seminal papers by F.Black and M.Scholes [BS73] and R.Merton [Me73], in which the famous "Black-Scholes Option Pricing Formula" was derived. The idea of developing a "formula" for the price of an option actually goes back as far as 1900, when L.Bachelier wrote a thesis with the title "Théorie de la spéculation" [B00]. It was Bachelier who firstly had the innovative idea of using a *stochastic process* as a model for the price evolution of a stock. For a stochastic process $(S_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ he made a natural and far-reaching choice being the first to give a mathematical definition of Brownian motion, which in the present context is interpreted as follows: S_0 is today's (known) price of a stock (say a share of company XYZ to fix ideas) while for the time $t > 0$ the price S_t is a normally distributed random variable.

The basic problem of Bachelier, as well as of modern Mathematical Finance in general, is that of assigning a price to a contingent claim. Bachelier used the equilibrium argument. It was the merit of Black and Scholes [BS73] and Merton [Me73] to have replaced this argument by a so-called "no-arbitrage" argument, which is of central importance to the entire theory. Roughly speaking, an arbitrage is a riskless way of making a profit with zero net investment. An economically very reasonable assumption on a financial market consists of requiring that there are no arbitrage opportunities. The remarkable fact is that this simple and primitive "principle of no arbitrage" allows already to determine a unique option price in the Black-Scholes model. This is the theme of the so-called *fundamental theorem of asset pricing* which states briefly that a process $S = (S_t)$ does not allow arbitrage opportunities if and only if there is an equivalent probability measure under which S is a martingale.

The history of the fundamental asset pricing theorem goes back to the seminal work of Harrison, Kreps and Pliska ([HK79], [HP81], and [K81]). After their pioneering work many authors made contributions to gradually improve the understanding about this fundamental theorem, e.g., Duffie and Huang [DH86], Stricker [St90], Dalang, Morton, and Willinger [DMW90], and [DS94] etc. In [DS98] this theorem was proved to hold true for very general (commutative) stochastic processes. More recently, the author [Ch1] proved a non-commutative version of this theorem.

In §3 we deal with this issue in the non-commutative setting based on finite dimensional Hilbert spaces, after having formalized the notations of (quantum) arbitrage and quantum trading strategies in §2. The corresponding theorems of pricing by no-arbitrage and optional decomposition are proved. We also obtain a characterization of complete markets in the non-commutative setting. Most of our presentation is inspired by, and follows quite closely, Schachermayer's lecture [Sc01].

For ease of reference a summary of the main results from finite dimensional quantum probability is given in §1 (for details see [P92]). As examples, the quantum model of binomial markets is studied in §4. We show that this quantum model ceases to pose the paradox which appears in the classical model of the binomial market. Furthermore, we re-deduce the Cox-Ross-Rubinstein binomial option pricing formula by considering multi-period quantum binomial markets.

1. Notational preliminaries

Throughout this paper, unless otherwise specifically mentioned, by a Hilbert space $\mathbf{H}$ we shall always mean a finite dimensional complex Hilbert spaces with scalar or inner product $< .,. >$ which is conjugate linear in the first and linear in the second variable. $\mathbf{C}^n$ denotes the n-dimensional complex Hilbert space of all complex $n \times 1$ matrices or column vectors with the standard inner product

$$< u, v >= \sum_j \bar{a}_j b_j$$

where

$$u = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ . \\ . \\ . \\ a_n \end{pmatrix}, \ v = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ . \\ . \\ . \\ b_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

By the *canonical basis* in $\mathbf{C}^n$ we mean the orthonormal basis $\{e_1, ..., e_n\}$ where e_j is the column vector with 1 in the j-th position and 0 elsewhere. When $n = 1$ drop the superscripts and denote the Hilbert space $\mathbf{C}^1$ by $\mathbf{C}$.

The set of all operators in $\mathbf{H}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H})$. The *adjoint* of a operator A is the unique operator A^* satisfying

$$< A^*u, v >=< u, Av >$$

for all u, v in $\mathbf{H}$. $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H})$ is an involutive Banach algebra with norm $\|.\|$ and involution *. Furthermore, for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H})$,

$$\|A\| = \|A^*\| = \|A^*A\|^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In other words $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H})$ is a C^*-algebra (indeed, a von Neumann algebra).

If λ is a scalar the same symbol will be frequently used to denote the operator $\lambda I, I$ denoting identity. For any A in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H})$, A is said to be *self-adjoint* if $A^* = A$. We write

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{H}) = \{A | A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}), \quad A = A^*\}$$

and observe that it is a real linear space. An operator A is said to be *positive* if $< u, Au >\geq 0$ for every u in $\mathbf{H}$. A positive operator is necessarily self-adjoint. If A_1, A_2 are in $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{H})$ we write $A_1 \geq A_2$ if $A_1 - A_2$ is a positive operator. $\geq$ is a partial order in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H})$. By a *projection* we shall always mean an orthogonal projection onto a subspace of $\mathbf{H}$. Denote the set of all projections in $\mathbf{H}$ by $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{H})$. A is a projection if and only if $A = A^* = A^2$. In particular, any projection E is a positive self-adjoint operator and $0 \leq E \leq 1$. Thus $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{H}) \subset \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{H}) \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H})$.

For any two elements u, v in $\mathbf{H}$ we define the operator $|u >< v|$ by

$$|u >< v|w =< v, w > u$$

for all w in $\mathbf{H}$. $|u >< v|$ is linear in u and conjugate linear in v and satisfies: $(|u >< v|)^* = |v >< u|$ and $\||u >< v|\| = \|u\|\|v\|$.

We shall now describe the quantum analogue of a classical probability space with n elementary outcomes or sample points. We consider n-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathbf{H}$ and call any element of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{H})$ an *event.* The elements 0 and 1 in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{H})$ are called the *null* and *certain* events respectively. If E_j are events we denote by $\cup E_j$ the event of occurrence of at least one of the E_j's whereas $\cap_j E_j$ is the event of simultaneous occurrence of all the E_j's, that is, $\cup_j E_j$ and $\cap_j E_j$ are respectively the projections on the smallest closed subspace containing the union and joint of range spaces of all E_j. If E_1, E_2 are events and $E_1 \leq E_2$ we say that E_1 implies E_2. If E is an event $1 - E$ is called its *complement.* If E_1, E_2 are events then $E_1 + E_2$ is an event if and only if $E_1 E_2 = 0$. Any one dimensional projection E in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{H})$ is an *atom* in the sense that it cannot be expressed as the sum of two non-null projections.

For any operator A on the n-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathbf{H}$ and any orthonormal basis $\{e_1, ..., e_n\}$ the quantity $\sum_j < e_j, Ae_j >$ is independent of the basis, called the trace of A and denoted by trA.

A positive operator ρ of unit trace is called a *state.* The set of all states in $\mathbf{H}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{H})$. For any fixed state ρ the triple $(\mathbf{H}, \rho)$ is called a *simple* or *finite dimensional quantum probability space.* For any E in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{H})$ the quantity $tr\rho E$ is called the *probability of the event E in the state ρ* and

$$tr\rho E = \sum_j < u_j, \rho u_j >$$

where $\{u_j\}$ is an orthonormal basis for the range of E. It follows from the spectral theorem that every state ρ can be expressed as

$$\rho = \sum_j p_j |u_j >< u_j|$$

where $p_j \geq 0, \sum p_j = 1$ and $\{u_j\}$ is an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of ρ such that

$$\rho u_j = p_j u_j$$

for each j. ρ is said to be *faithful* if its eigenvalues are all greater than zero, that is, $p_j > 0$ for all j. Any one dimensional projection is called a *pure state.* The extreme points of convex set $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{H})$ are precisely the pure states. In this context it is worth noting that in a sample space of n elementary outcomes in classical probability the set of all probability distributions is a convex set whose extreme points are precisely the n degenerate distributions. In its quantum analogue the set of pure states is a manifold of dimension $2n - 2$. It is the richness of the extreme points of convex set $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{H})$ that makes quantum probability worth exploring even in finite dimensions.

Elements of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{H})$, i.e., Hermitian operators in $\mathbf{H}$, are called *observables.* An observable in quantum probability is what a random variable is in classical probability. Any observable X, being a self-adjoint operator, has the spectral resolution

$$X = \sum_j x_j E_j^X$$

where $x_1, x_2, ...$ are its distinct eigenvalues and E_j^X is the *event that X takes the value x_j*. If g is a real valued function on the real line $\mathbf{R}$ then

$$g(X) = \sum_j g(x_j) E_j^X$$

is also an observable. The mapping $g \to g(X)$ is a homomorphism from the algebra of real functions on $\mathbf{R}$ into the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H})$. Events are observables assuming at most two values $0, 1$.

Let ρ be a state and let X be an observable with spectral resolution $X = \sum_j x_j E_j^X$. The probability of the event E_j^X, i.e., X takes the value x_j in the state ρ, is equal to $tr\rho E_j^X$. X has *expectation* $E_\rho(X)$ in the state ρ

$$E_\rho(X) = \sum_j x_j tr\rho E_j^X = tr\rho \sum_j x_j E_j^X = tr\rho X.$$

For any real valued function on $\mathbf{R}$ the expectation $E_\rho[g(X)]$ of $g(X)$ in the state ρ is equal to

$$E_\rho[g(X)] = \sum_j g(x_j) tr\rho E_j^X = tr\rho g(X).$$

If u is a unit vector in $\mathbf{H}$ then in the pure state u (i.e., when $\rho = |u >< u|$) X has the distribution with mass $< u, E_j^X u >$ at x_j for each j, and expectation $< u, Xu >$. If X is a non-negative observable or, equivalently, X is a positive operator then $tr\rho X \geq 0$ for any state ρ. Thus expectation in a state is a non-negative linear map from $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{H})$ into $\mathbf{R}$ with value unitary for the observable 1.

2. Non-commutative martingales and arbitrage-free

In the sequel we shall denote $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H})$ by $\mathcal{A}$ and assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is filtered, so that there exists a family $(\mathcal{A}_t)_{t=0}^T$ of unital (closed) $*$- subalgebras of $\mathcal{A}$, such that $\mathcal{A}_s \subset \mathcal{A}_t$ for all s, t with $s \leq t$, and $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathbf{C}I, I$ denoting the identity on $\mathbf{H}$. Given any fixed state ρ. A sequence $\{M_t\}_{t=0}^T$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be a (non-commutative) martingale with respect to $(\mathbf{H}, (\mathcal{A}_t)_{t=0}^T, \rho)$ if it is adapted to $(\mathcal{A}_t)_{t=0}^T$ and for every $t = 1, ..., T$,

$$E_\rho A^* M_t A = E_\rho A^* M_{t-1} A,$$

for all operators $A \in \mathcal{A}_{t-1}$.

We would like to mention that the non-commutative martingales are usually defined and studied under a (normal) tracial state (see [PX97] for example). In that case, the corresponding conditional expectation operator exists and hence one may define the martingales as in the classical setting. However, even for a state ρ in a finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathbf{H}$ the conditional expectation operator $E_\rho[.|\mathcal{B}]$ of a $*$-subalgebra $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H})$ need not exist in general (for details see [Ta72]). Thus we cannot define a martingale under ρ as in the case of the tracial states or the commutative setting. Recently, the author [Ch1] generalized

the definition of the non-commutative martingales to the case of general states as above and show that it is suitable in the non-commutative generalization of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing (see also Theorem 2.1 below). In what follows one may find that this definition is natural and suitable in "quantum finance".

Together with $(\mathcal{A}, \rho)$ we shall also consider the opposite algebra $\mathcal{A}^{op}$, with the state ρ^{op}, namely $\rho = \rho^{op}$ as a linear map on $\mathcal{A}$, but the notation is meant to stress the algebra structure we are using. The spaces $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ have natural $\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}$ bimodule structures given by multiplication on the right and on the left, namely $A.U.B = AUB$ and $A.(U \otimes V).B = AU \otimes VB$, or equivalently they have a left $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{op}$-module structure. We shall denote by $\sharp$ these actions, namely one has $(A \otimes B)\sharp U = AUB$ and $(A \otimes B)\sharp(U \otimes V) = (AU) \otimes (VB)$.

A $\mathcal{A}$-valued biprocess is a sequence $H = (H_t)_{t=1}^T$ in the algebraic tensor product $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{op}$. It is called to be predictable if one has that $H_t \in \mathcal{A}_{t-1} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{t-1}$ for all $t = 1, ..., T$. In this case, it is clear that one can choose a decomposition

$$H_t = \sum_{j=1}^{m} A_j \otimes B_j \tag{1}$$

with $A_j,\ B_j \in \mathcal{A}_{t-1}$ for $j = 1, ..., m$ (in the sequel we shall always assume that the decompositions we choose satisfy such properties).

Definition 2.1. A *quantum model* of a financial market based on the filtered quantum base $(\mathbf{H}, (\mathcal{A}_t)_{t=0}^T)$ is an $\mathbf{R} \times \mathcal{A}^d$-valued stochastic process (B, S), where $B = (B_0, B_1, ..., B_T)$ is called a bank account, and

$$S = (S_t)_{t=0}^T = (S_t^1, ..., S_t^d)_{t=0}^T,$$

where $S^j = (S_t^j)_{t=0}^T$ is a sequence of positive operators with $S_t^j \in \mathcal{A}_t$, which describes the dynamics of the value of the j-th risk asset $S^j, j = 1, ..., d$.

Definition 2.2. $\mathcal{H}$ denotes the set of *quantum trading strategies* based on the filtered quantum base $(\mathbf{H}, (\mathcal{A}_t)_{t=0}^T)$. An element $H \in \mathcal{H}$ is an $\mathcal{A}$-valued biprocess $(H_t)_{t=0}^T$ such that $H_0 \in \mathbf{R}$ and for $t = 1, ..., T$,

$$H_t = \sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k A_k^* \otimes A_k,$$

where a_k are all real numbers and $A_k \in \mathcal{A}_{t-1}$. We write

$$\mathcal{H}^d = \{(H^1, ..., H^d) : H^j \in \mathcal{H},\ j = 1, ..., d\}.$$

An *investment portfolio* on the (B, S)-market is a sequence $\Pi = (\beta, \gamma)$ where $\beta = (\beta_0, \beta_1, ..., \beta_T)$ is a sequence of real numbers, and $\gamma = (H^1, ..., H^d) \in \mathcal{H}^d$.

The *value process* of an investment portfolio $\Pi = (\beta, \gamma)$ on the (B, S)-market is the operator sequence $\Pi\sharp(B, S) = ([\Pi\sharp(B, S)]_t)_{t=0}^T$, where

$$[\Pi\sharp(B, S)]_t = \beta_t B_t + \sum_{j=1}^{d} H_t^j \sharp S_t^j.$$

We say that an investment portfolio $\Pi = (\beta, \gamma)$ is *self-financing* if its value $\Pi\sharp(B,S) = ([\Pi\sharp(B,S)]_t)_{t=0}^T$ can be represented as following

$$[\Pi\sharp(B,S)]_t = [\Pi\sharp(B,S)]_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{t}(\beta_k \triangle B_k + \sum_{j=1}^{d} H_k^j \sharp \triangle S_k^j)$$

for $t = 1, ..., T$, where $\triangle B_k = B_k - B_{k-1}, \triangle S_k^j = S_k^j - S_{k-1}^j$.

Remark 2.1. In what follows, we always assume that investment portfolios are self-financing. Set $\overline{B} = (\overline{B}_t)_{t=0}^T$ with $\overline{B}_t = 1$ for all $t = 0, 1, ..., T$, and $\overline{S} = (\frac{S_t}{B_t})_{t=0}^T$, which is said to be the discounted process of S in the (B,S)-market. As in the classical setting, without loss of generality we can replace (B,S) by $(\overline{B}, \overline{S})$. In the sequel we shall always assume that $B_t \equiv 1$ for all $t = 0, 1, ..., T$, when not specially stated. In this case, any self-financing investment portfolio $\Pi = (\beta, \gamma)$ can be reduced to a (d-tuple) quantum trading strategy $H = (H^1, ..., H^d)$ in S so that

$$[\Pi\sharp(B,S)]_t = \alpha + (H\sharp S)_t, \quad t = 1, ..., T,$$

where $(H\sharp S)_t = \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{j=1}^d H_k^j \sharp \triangle S_k^j$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let H be a d-tuple quantum trading strategy. If $S = (S_t^1, ..., S_t^d)_{t=0}^T$ is a $\mathcal{A}^d$-valued martingale with respect to $(\mathbf{H}, (\mathcal{A}_t)_{t=0}^T, \rho)$ then the value process $H\sharp S$ of H in the financial market S is also a martingale with respect to $(\mathbf{H}, (\mathcal{A}_t)_{t=0}^T, \rho)$.*

Proof. Let $H_t = (A_1^* \otimes A_1, ..., A_d^* \otimes A_d)$ where $A_j \in \mathcal{A}_{t-1}$ for all $j = 1, ..., d$. We have to prove that for each $m = 1, ..., T$

$$E_\rho Y^*[(H\sharp S)_m - (H\sharp S)_{m-1}]Y = 0$$

for all $Y \in \mathcal{A}_{m-1}$. One has that

$$(H\sharp S)_m - (H\sharp S)_{m-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{d} H_m^k \sharp (S_m^k - S_{m-1}^k) = \sum_{k=1}^{d} A_k^*(S_t^k - S_{t-1}^k)A_k$$

when $m = t$ and $= 0$ otherwise. Since $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale, we get the result. The general case follows since linear combinations of martingales are martingales.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $S = (S_t^1, ..., S_t^d)_{t=0}^T$ be adapted to $(\mathbf{H}, (\mathcal{A}_t)_{t=0}^T)$. Then S is a martingale with respect to $(\mathbf{H}, (\mathcal{A}_t)_{t=0}^T, \rho)$ if and only if*

$$E_\rho (H \circ S)_T = 0,$$

for every $H \in \mathcal{H}^d$.

Proof. Suppose that $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a martingale. By Lemma 2.1 one concludes that

$$E_\rho(H\sharp S)_T = E_\rho(H\sharp S)_0 = 0,$$

for each $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

Conversely, let $Y \in \mathcal{A}_{t-1}$ for some $t = 1, ..., T$. Set $H_t^k = Y^* \otimes Y$. Then

$$(H\sharp S)_T = Y^*(S_t^k - S_{t-1}^k)Y,$$

and hence $E_\rho Y^*[S_t^k - S_{t-1}^k]Y = 0$. This concludes that $(S_t^k)_{t=0}^T$ is a martingale. The proof is complete.

Definition 2.3. We call the subspace $\mathcal{K}$ of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{H})$ defined by

$$\mathcal{K} = \{(H\sharp S)_T : H \in \mathcal{H}^d\}$$

the set of non-commutative contingent claims attainable at price 0.

Remark 2.2. The economic interpretation is the following: the non-commutative random variables $K = (H\sharp S)_T$, for some $H \in \mathcal{H}^d$, are precisely those (non-commutative) contingent claims that an (quantum) economic agent may replicate with zero initial investment by pursuing some predictable quantum trading strategy H.

For any $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$, we call the set of contingent claims attainable at price α the affine space $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ obtained by shifting $\mathcal{K}$ by the constant operator α, in other words the non-commutative random variables of the form $\alpha + (H\sharp S)_T$, for some quantum trading strategy H. A quantum financial market S is said to be *complete* if each $A \in O(\mathcal{A}_T) = \mathcal{A}_T \cap \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{H})$ is replicable, that is, $O(\mathcal{A}_T) = \cup_{\alpha\in\mathbf{R}}\mathcal{K}_\alpha$.

Definition 2.4. We call the convex cone $\mathcal{C}$ in $O(\mathcal{A}_T)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{C} = \{C \in O(\mathcal{A}_T) : \textit{ there is some } K \in \mathcal{K}, K \geq C\}$$

the set of non-commutative contingent claims super-replicable at price 0.

Observe that $\mathcal{C}$ is a convex cone containing the negative elements $\{A \in O(\mathcal{A}_T) : A \leq 0\}$.

Economically speaking, a non-commutative contingent claim $A \in O(\mathcal{A}_T)$ is super-replicable at price 0, if one quantum agent can achieve it with zero net investment, subsequently pursuing some predictable quantum trading strategy H–thus arriving at some non-commutative contingent claim K–and then, possibly, "throwing away money" to arrive at A. This operation of "throwing away money" may seem awkward at this stage, but we shall see later that the set $\mathcal{C}$ plays an important role in the development of the present theory, as in the commutative setting.

Definition 2.5. A quantum financial market S satisfies the no-arbitrage condition (NA) if

$$\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{A}_+ = \{0\}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{A}_+ = \{0\},$$

where $\mathcal{A}_+ = \{A \in \mathcal{A} : A \geq 0\}$.

In other words we now formalize the concept of an (quantum) arbitrage possibility: it consists of the existence of a d-tuple quantum trading strategy H such that—starting from an initial investment zero—the resulting contingent claim $f = (H\sharp S)_T$ is non-negative and not identically equal to zero. If a (quantum) financial market does not allow for arbitrage we say that it satisfies the *no-arbitrage condition* (NA).

Definition 2.6. A state ρ on $\mathbf{H}$ is called a martingale state of $S = (S_t^1, ..., S_t^d)_{t=0}^T$, if S is a $\mathcal{A}^d$-valued martingale with respect to $(\mathbf{H}, (\mathcal{A}_t)_{t=0}^T, \rho)$.

We denote by $M(S)$ (or, $M_f(S)$) the family of all such (faithful) martingale states, and say that S satisfies the condition of the existence of a faithful martingale state (EMS) if $M_f(S) \neq \emptyset$.

As usual, a faithful martingale state is called a *risk-neutral state* of the market.

Lemma 2.3. *For a state ρ on $\mathbf{H}$ the following are equivalent:*
(1) $\rho \in M(S)$,
(2) $E_\rho[K] = 0$, *for all* $K \in \mathcal{K}$,
(3) $E_\rho[C] \leq 0$, *for all* $C \in \mathcal{C}$.

Proof. The equivalences are rather trivial, the equivalence of (1) and (2) immediately follows from Lemma 2.2 while the equivalence of (2) and (3) is straightforward.

After having fixed these formalities we may formulate and prove a quantum analogue of the central result of the finance theory of pricing and hedging by no-arbitrage, the so-called fundamental theorem of asset pricing, which goes back to Harrison and Pliska [HP81] in the classical case.

Theorem 2.1 *For a quantum financial market S modelled on a finite dimensional quantum stochastic base $(\mathbf{H}, (\mathcal{A}_t)_{t=0}^T)$ it satisfies (NA) if and only if $M_f(S) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. (EMS) $\rightarrow$ (NA): By Lemma 2.2 we have that $E_\sigma[C] \leq 0$ for each $\sigma \in M_f(S)$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}$. However, if (EMS) would hold and (NA) were violated, there would exist a $\sigma \in M_f(S)$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}, C > 0$, whence $E_\sigma[C] > 0$ since σ is faithful, a contradiction.

(NA) $\rightarrow$ (EMS): Since $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{H})$ is a convex, compact subset of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{H})$ and, by the (NA) assumption, disjoint from $\mathcal{K}$, there is $Q \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{H})$ and $\alpha < \beta$ such that

$$tr[KQ] \leq \alpha, \quad K \in \mathcal{K};$$

$$tr[VQ] \geq \beta, \quad V \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{H}).$$

As $\mathcal{K}$ is a linear space, we have that $\alpha \geq 0$. Hence $\beta > 0$. Therefore $A \rightarrow tr[QA]$ is a positive, faithful linear functional on $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{H})$. Normalize Q we obtain a faithful martingale state of S by Lemma 2.3.

Remark 2.3. Theorem 2.1 is a special case of the non-commutative version of the fundamental asset pricing theorem, which was proved in [Ch1]. However, the proof presented here is different from that of [Ch1].

Theorem 2.2. *Let S satisfy (NA) and $A \in O(\mathcal{A}_T)$ so that*

$$A = \alpha + (H\sharp S)_T, \tag{2}$$

for some $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$ and some trading strategy H. Then, the constant α is uniquely determined by (2) and

$$\alpha = E_\sigma[A] \tag{3}$$

for every $\sigma \in M_f(S)$.

Proof. Suppose that there were two representations $A = \alpha_1 + (H^1\sharp S)_T$ and $A = \alpha_2 + (H^2\sharp S)_T$ with $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$. Assuming $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$ we find an obvious arbitrage possibility: we have

$$\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 = ([H^1 - H^2]\sharp S)_T,$$

that is, the trading strategy $H^1 - H^2$ produces a strictly positive result at time T, a contradiction to (NA).

The equation (3) results from the fact that, for every quantum trading strategy H and every $\sigma \in M_f(S)$, the process $(H\sharp S)$ is a martingale under σ. The proof is complete.

Remark 2.4. Theorem 2.2 says that if a contingent claim is replicable, its price is just the expectation of its payoff with respect to a (or, any) faithful martingale state on the underlying market. Moreover, the converse to Theorem 2.2 still holds true, see Theorem 3.1 below.

3. Pricing by no-arbitrage and optimal decomposition

Denote by $cone[M(S)]$ and $cone[M_f(S)]$ the cones generated by the convex sets $M(S)$ and $M_f(S)$ respectively. As following we shall clarify the polar relation between these cones and the cone $\mathcal{C}$.

Recall that, for a pair (E, E^*) of vector spaces in separating duality via the scalar product $< ., . >$, the polar Q^0 of a set Q in E is defined as

$$Q^0 = \{g \in E^* :< f, g >\leq 1, f \in Q\}.$$

In the case when $Q = \mathcal{C}$ which is a closed convex cone we have that

$$\mathcal{C}^0 = \{g \in E^* :< C, g >\leq 0, \ for \ all \ C \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

The bipolar theorem (see for example [Sch66]) states that the bipolar $Q^{00} := (Q^0)^0$ of a set Q in E is the $\sigma(E, E^*)$-closed convex hull of E. Note that in our finite dimensional setting $\mathcal{C}$ is closed. Hence we deduce from the bipolar theorem that $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^{00}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that S satisfies (NA). Then the polar of $\mathcal{C}$ is equal to cone$[M(S)]$ and $M_f(S)$ is dense in $M(S)$. Hence the following assertions are equivalent for $A \in O(\mathcal{A}_T)$:*

(a) $A \in \mathcal{C}$;

(b) $E_\sigma[A] \leq 0$, *for all* $\sigma \in M(S)$;

(c) $E_\sigma[A] \leq 0$, *for all* $\sigma \in M_f(S)$.

Proof. The fact that the polar $\mathcal{C}^0$ and *cone*$[M(S)]$ coincide, follows from Lemma 2.3. Hence the equivalence of (a) and (b) follows from the bipolar theorem.

As regards the density of $M_f(S)$ in $M(S)$ we first deduce from Theorem 2.1 that there is at least one $\rho \in M_f(S)$. For any $\sigma \in M(S)$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ we have that $\alpha\rho + (1-\alpha)\sigma \in M_f(S)$, which clearly implies that $M_f(S)$ is dense in $M(S)$. The equivalence of (b) and (c) is obvious.

For an element $A \in O(\mathcal{A}_T)$, we call $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$ an *arbitrage-free price,* if

$$\mathcal{C}^{A,\alpha} \cap \mathcal{A}_+ = \{0\},$$

where $\mathcal{C}^{A,\alpha}$ denotes the cone spanned by $\mathcal{C}$ and the linear space spanned by $A - \alpha$.

The next theorem tells us precisely what the quantum principle of no-arbitrage can tell us about the possible prices for a non-commutative contingent claim A. In the classical case it goes back to the work of D.Kreps [K81].

Theorem 3.1 *Assume that S satisfies (NA) and $A \in O(\mathcal{A}_T)$. Define*

$$\overline{\pi}(A) = \sup\{E_\sigma[A] : \sigma \in M_f(S)\}, \tag{4}$$

and

$$\underline{\pi}(A) = \inf\{E_\sigma[A] : \sigma \in M_f(S)\}. \tag{5}$$

Either $\underline{\pi}(A) = \overline{\pi}(A)$, in which case A is attainable at price $\pi(A) := \underline{\pi}(A) = \overline{\pi}(A)$, i.e., $A = \pi(A) + (H \circ S)_T$ for some $H \in \mathcal{H}$; therefore $\pi(A)$ is the unique arbitrage-free price for A.

Or $\underline{\pi}(A) < \overline{\pi}(A)$, *in which case* $\{E_\sigma[A] : \sigma \in M_f(S)\}$ *equals the open interval* $(\underline{\pi}(A), \overline{\pi}(A))$, *which in turn equals the set of arbitrage-free prices for the non-commutative contingent claim* A.

Proof. First observe that the set $\{E_\sigma[A] : \sigma \in M_f(S)\}$ forms a bounded nonempty interval in $\mathbf{R}$, which we denote by I. We claim that a number $\alpha \in I$ if and only if α is an arbitrage-free price for A. Indeed, supposing that $\alpha \in I$ we may find $\sigma \in M_f(S)$ such that $E_\sigma[A] = \alpha$ and hence, $\mathcal{C}^{A,\alpha} \cap \mathcal{A}_+ = \{0\}$.

Conversely, suppose that $\mathcal{C}^{A,\alpha} \cap \mathcal{A}_+ = \{0\}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}^{A,\alpha}$ is a closed convex cone, by the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 one concludes that there exists a faithful state σ such that $\sigma[R] \leq 0$ for all $R \in \mathcal{C}^{A,\alpha}$. This implies that $E_\sigma[A] = \alpha$, that is, $\alpha \in I$. Suppose that $\alpha = \overline{\pi}(A)$, and consider $A - \overline{\pi}(A)$. By definition we have that $E_\sigma[A - \overline{\pi}(A)] \leq 0$, for all $\sigma \in M_f(S)$, and therefore by Lemma 3.1, that $A - \overline{\pi}(A) \in \mathcal{C}$. We may find $K \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $K \geq A - \overline{\pi}(A)$. If the sup in (4) is attained, that is, if there is $\rho \in M_f(S)$ such that $E_\rho[A] = \overline{\pi}(A)$, then we have that

$$0 = E_\rho[K] \geq E_\rho[A - \overline{\pi}(A)] = 0$$

which implies that $K = A - \overline{\pi}(A)$; in other words A is attainable at price $\overline{\pi}(A)$. This in turn implies that $E_\sigma[A] = \overline{\pi}(A)$, for all $\sigma \in M_f(S)$, and thus I is reduced to the singleton $\{\overline{\pi}(A)\}$.

Hence, if $\underline{\pi}(A) < \overline{\pi}(A), \overline{\pi}(A)$ cannot belong to the interval I, which is therefore open on the right hand side. Passing from A to $-A$ we obtain the analogous result for the left hand side of I, which thus concludes that $I = (\underline{\pi}(A), \overline{\pi}(A))$. The proof is complete.

Corollary 3.1 *For a quantum financial market* S *satisfying* (NA) *the following are equivalent:*

(i) $M_f(S)$ *consists of a single element* ρ *restricted on* $\mathcal{A}_T$, *in the sense that* $\rho = \sigma$ *if and only if* $E_\rho A = E_\sigma A$ *for all* $A \in \mathcal{A}_T$.

(ii) Each element $A \in O(\mathcal{A}_T)$ *may be represented as*

$$A = \alpha + (H \sharp S)_T, \tag{6}$$

for some $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$ *and some trading strategy* H. *In this case* $\alpha = E_\rho[A]$.

Proof. The implication (i) $\rightarrow$ (ii) immediately follows from Theorem 3.1. For the implication (ii) $\rightarrow$ (i), note that (6) implies that $\alpha = E_\rho[A]$ for all $\rho \in M_f(S)$. Hence, if $M_f(S)$ contains two different elements ρ_1 and ρ_2 restricted on $\mathcal{A}_T$, we may find that an element $A \in O(\mathcal{A}_T)$ so that $E_{\rho_1}[A] \neq E_{\rho_2}[A]$. This completes the proof.

Corollary 3.1 is the non-commutative analogue of the "second fundamental asset pricing theorem" as called in [Sh99]. It shows that an arbitrage-free (quantum) financial market S is complete if and only if $M_f(S) = \{\rho\}$ for some faithful state ρ on $\mathbf{H}$, in the sense that $\rho = \sigma$ if and only if $E_\rho A = E_\sigma A$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}_T$.

As following is a dynamic version of Theorem 3.1 on pricing by no-arbitrage, which holds true in a general commutative setting (see [K96]).

Theorem 3.2 *Suppose that S satisfies (NA) and let $V = (V_t)_{t=0}^T$ be an adapted self-adjoint stochastic process. The following assertions are equivalent:*

(a) V is a super-martingale for each $\rho \in M_f(S)$ in the sense that, for every $t = 1, ..., T$,

$$E_\rho A^* V_t A \leq E_\rho A^* V_{t-1} A,$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{A}_{t-1}$.

(b) V can be decomposed into

$$V = V_0 + H\sharp S - C,$$

where $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $C = (C_t)_{t=0}^T$ is an increasing adapted process with starting at 0, that is, $0 = C_0 \leq C_{t-1} \leq C_t$ for all $t = 1, ..., T$.

Proof. First assume that $T = 1$, i.e., we have a one-period model $S = (S_0, S_1)$. Since $\mathcal{A}_0$ is trivial, $V_0 =$ some $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$. Assuming (a) we concludes from Lemma 3.1 that there is a quantum trading strategy H such that

$$V_0 + (H\sharp S)_1 \geq V_1.$$

Letting $C_0 = 0$ and writing $\Delta C_1 = C_1 = V_0 + (H\sharp S)_1 - V_1$ we obtain the required decomposition.

Note that Lemma 3.1 holds true without assumption that $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathbf{C}I$. We apply the above argument to the one-period financial market (S_{t-1}, S_t) adapted to the filtration $\{\mathcal{A}_{t-1}, \mathcal{A}_t\}$. We thus obtain a $H_t \in \mathcal{A}_{t-1}$ such that

$$V_{t-1} + H_t\sharp\Delta S_t \geq V_t.$$

Setting $\Delta C_t = V_{t-1} + H_t\sharp\Delta S_t - V_t$ yields that

$$\Delta V_t = H_t\sharp\Delta S_t - \Delta C_t.$$

This finishes the construction of the optional decomposition: define the predictable process H as $(H_t)_{t=1}^T$, and the adapted increasing process C by $C_t = \sum_{j=1}^t \Delta C_j$. This shows that (a) implies (b).

The converse implication is trivial. The proof is complete.

A process of the form $V = V_0 + H\sharp S - C$ can be though of the wealth process of an economic (quantum) agent, starting at an initial wealth V_0, subsequently investing in the quantum financial market according to the quantum trading strategy H, and consuming as described by the process C : the random variable C_t models the accumulated consumption during the time interval $\{1, ..., T\}$. The above theorem states economically that these wealth processes are characterized by condition (a).

4. Quantum binomial models

Example 1. (A single-step model) We consider a simple 'single-step' model of a (B, S)-market formed by a bank account $B = (B_0, B_1)$ and some stock of price $S = (S_0, S_1)$. We assume that the constants B_0 and S_0 are positive and

$$B_1 = B_0(1 + r), \quad S_1 = S_0(1 + A),$$

where the interest rate r is a constant ($r > -1$) and the rate A is an observable with the spectral resolution

$$A = \sum_{j=1}^{m} a_j E_j^A,$$

where $a_j > -1$ for all $j = 1, ..., m$.

Along with the (B, S)-market we can consider its discounted market $(\bar{B}, \bar{S})$, where

$$\bar{B} = (\bar{B}_0, \bar{B}_1) \text{ with } \bar{B}_0 = \bar{B}_1 = 1$$

and

$$\bar{S} = (\bar{S}_0, \bar{S}_1) \text{ with } \bar{S}_0 = \tfrac{S_0}{B_0}, \quad \bar{S}_1 = \tfrac{S_1}{B_1}.$$

Then, it is easy to check that for $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{H}), E_\rho \bar{S}_1 = \bar{S}_0$ if and only if

$$E_\rho A = r. \tag{7}$$

In the sequel, we let $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{C}^2$ with its canonical basis $|0>= \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, |1>= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{H})$ has the basis

$$I_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \ \sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \ \sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \ \sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where σ_x, σ_y, and σ_z are the well-known Pauli spin matrices of quantum mechanics. Set

$$A = x_0 I_2 + x_1 \sigma_x + x_2 \sigma_y + x_3 \sigma_z,$$

which takes two values

$$a = x_0 - \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2}, \quad b = x_0 + \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2},$$

where x_j are all real numbers such that $x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 \neq 0$ and $a, b > -1$.

Theorem 4.1 *With notations as above, the single-period quantum binomial model is arbitrage-free if and only if $-1 < a < r < b$. In this case, the set of its risk-neutral states consists of*

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(I_2 + x\sigma_x + y\sigma_y + z\sigma_z) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + z & x - iy \\ x + iy & 1 - z \end{pmatrix}, \tag{8}$$

where all (x, y, z) *satisfy*

$$\begin{cases} x^2 + y^2 + z^2 < 1, \\ x_1 x + x_2 y + x_3 z = r - \frac{a+b}{2}, \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

which is a disk of radius $\sqrt{1 - \frac{(2r-a-b)^2}{(b-a)^2}}$ *in the unit ball of* $\mathbf{R}^3$.

Proof. Given

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(wI_2 + x\sigma_x + y\sigma_y + z\sigma_z) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} w+z & x-iy \\ x+iy & w-z \end{pmatrix},$$

which takes two values

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{2}\left(w - \sqrt{x^2+y^2+z^2}\right), \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{2}\left(w + \sqrt{x^2+y^2+z^2}\right).$$

Then, ρ is a faithful state if and only if $tr\rho = 1$ and $\lambda_1 > 0$. This concludes that $w = 1$ and

$$x^2 + y^2 + z^2 < 1.$$

Moreover, by $tr\rho A = r$ one concludes that

$$x_1 x + x_2 y + x_3 z = r - \frac{a+b}{2},$$

which completes the proof.

We are interested in European call options in the single-period quantum binomial market introduced above. Let K be the exercise price of the European call option. Then its payoff is of form

$$H = (S_1 - K)^+,$$

which takes values

$$h_a = [S_0(1+a) - K]^+$$

and

$$h_b = [S_0(1+b) - K]^+.$$

Let C be the option value at time 0. Since $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathbf{C}I$, there is a replicating portfolio of a pair (β, γ) of real numbers such that

$$H = \beta B_1 + \gamma S_1 = \beta B_0 + \gamma S_0 + \beta \triangle B_1 + \gamma \triangle S_1.$$

A simple computation yields that

$$\beta = \frac{1}{B_0(1+r)} \frac{h_a S_b - h_b S_a}{S_b - S_a}, \quad \gamma = \frac{h_b - h_a}{S_b - S_a},$$

where $S_a = S_0(1+a), S_b = S_0(1+b)$. Hence H is replicable and, by Theorem 2.2,

$$C = \beta B_0 + \gamma S_0 = \frac{1}{1+r}\left(\frac{b-r}{b-a}h_a + \frac{r-a}{b-a}h_b\right). \tag{10}$$

Also, it is easy to check that

$$C = E_\rho H = \frac{1}{1+r}\left(\frac{b-r}{b-a}h_a + \frac{r-a}{b-a}h_b\right) \tag{11}$$

for all risk-neutral states ρ in (8) and (9), as stated in (3) of Theorem 2.2.

Recall that the classical single-period binomial model is formed by a bank account $B = (B_0, B_1)$ and some stock of price $S = (S_0, S_1)$, in which one assumes that the constants B_0 and S_0 are positive,

$$B_1 = B_0(1+r), \quad S_1 = S_0(1+R),$$

where R is a random variable taking just two values, a and b, such that

$$-1 < a < r < b.$$

It is well known that the European call option pricing formula on this model is the same as equation (10).

It is surprising and seems counterintuitive that the option pricing formula in equation (10) does not involve the probabilities of the stock price moving up ($R = b$) or down ($R = a$) in the classical case. For example, we get the same option price when the probability of $R = b$ is 0.5 as we do when it is 0.9. However, a classical view, dating back to the times of J.Bernoulli and C.Huygens, is that

$$\frac{1}{1+r}E(S_1 - K)^+ = \frac{1}{1+r}\left(ph_b + (1-p)h_a\right)$$

with $p = \mathbf{P}(R = b)$, could be a reasonable price of such an option in the classical random model. It should be emphasized, however, that this quantity depends essentially on our assumption on the value p. This is not the case.

There are some explanations on this paradox in the classical model of the binomial market, see for example [Hu00, p.205]. However, the quantum model ceases to pose the paradox. The key reason that we conclude from the single-period quantum binomial market introduced above is that there do not exist at all the probabilities of the stock price moving up or down in the single-period quantum binomial market. In the single-period quantum binomial market all individuals are indifferent to the movement in the stock price. The probability of an upward movement in the stock price appearing in the classical case comes from one observer's measurement to the stock. Each individual is indeed in favor of some different value of its upward or down probability. Precisely, suppose that

$$A = a|u><u| + b|v><v|,$$

where $\{u, v\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbf{C}^2$. Then, for every state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{C}^2)$ the probabilities of that A takes the values a and b in the state ρ are equal to

$$tr\rho|u><u| =< u, \rho u >$$

and

$$tr\rho|v><v| =< v, \rho v >,$$

respectively, which are those probabilities appearing in the classical setting when one observer measures the stock market on the state ρ. (For more details see [Ch2].) From this one could conclude that the quantum binomial market is much more suited to real-world financial markets rather than the classical one.

Example 2. (The Cox-Ross-Rubinstein binomial option pricing formula) Since there is a paradox in the classical model of the binomial market, the classical random model is not suitable for getting the Cox-Ross-Rubinstein binomial option pricing formula. As following we shall re-deduce this famous formula by using multi-period quantum binomial markets.

Let $\mathbf{H}_n = (\mathbf{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$ and write

$$|\varepsilon_1...\varepsilon_n >= |\varepsilon_1 > \otimes ... \otimes |\varepsilon_n >, \quad \varepsilon_1, ..., \varepsilon_n = 0, 1.$$

Then, $\{|\varepsilon_1...\varepsilon_n >: \varepsilon_1, ..., \varepsilon_n = 0, 1\}$ is the canonical basis of $\mathbf{H}_n$. Given $-1 < a < r < b$, we define a N-period quantum binomial market (B, S) with $B = (B_0, B_1, ..., B_N)$ and $S = (S_0, S_1, ..., S_N)$ as following:

$$B_n = B_0(1+r)^n, \quad S_n = S_0 \bigotimes_{j=1}^{n}(1 + A_j) \otimes I_{N-n}, \quad n = 1, ..., N, \tag{12}$$

where the constants B_0 and S_0 are positive, I_{N-n} is the identity on $\mathbf{H}_{N-n}$ and,

$$A_j = \frac{a+b}{2} I_2 + x_{1j}\sigma_x + x_{2j}\sigma_y + x_{3j}\sigma_z,$$

where

$$x_{1j}^2 + x_{2j}^2 + x_{3j}^2 = \frac{(b-a)^2}{4}$$

for all $j = 1, ..., N$.

Consider European call options in the N-period quantum binomial market (B, S). Its payoff is

$$H_N = (S_N - K)^+,$$

where K is the exercise price of the European call option. There are N orthonormal bases $\{(u_j, v_j), j = 1, ..., N\}$ in $\mathbf{C}^2$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} S_N &= S_0 \otimes_{j=1}^N (1 + A_j) \\ &= S_0 \otimes_{j=1}^N [(1+b)|u_j >< u_j| + (1+a)|v_j >< v_j|] \\ &= S_0 \textstyle\sum_{n=0}^N (1+b)^n (1+a)^{N-n} [\sum_{|\sigma|=n} \otimes_{j=1}^N |w_{j\sigma} >< w_{j\sigma}|] \end{aligned}$$

where all σ are subsets of $\{1, ..., N\}$, $w_{j\sigma} = u_j$ for $j \in \sigma$ or $w_{j\sigma} = v_j$ otherwise. Then

$$(S_N - K)^+ = \sum_{n=0}^{N} [S_0(1+b)^n(1+a)^{N-n} - K]^+ [\sum_{|\sigma|=n} \bigotimes_{j=1}^{N} |w_{j\sigma} >< w_{j\sigma}|],$$

which is replicable in (B, S) by induction.

By Theorem 4.1 one has that all states of the form

$$\bigotimes_{j=1}^{N} \rho_j = \frac{1}{2^N} \bigotimes_{j=1}^{N} (I_2 + x_j\sigma_x + y_j\sigma_y + z_j\sigma_z) \tag{13}$$

are faithful martingale states of the N-period quantum binomial market (B, S), where (x_j, y_j, z_j) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} x^2 + y^2 + z^2 < 1, \\ x_{1j}x + x_{2j}y + x_{3j}z = r - \frac{a+b}{2}, \end{cases}$$

for every $j = 1, ..., N$. Hence, by the principle of risk-neutral valuation, the price C_0^N at time 0 of the European call option $(S_N - K)^+$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} C_0^N &= tr[(\textstyle\bigotimes_{j=1}^{N} \rho_j)(S_N - K)^+] \\ &= (1+r)^{-N} \textstyle\sum_{n=0}^{N} \frac{N!}{n!(N-n)!} q^n (1-q)^{N-n} [S_0(1+b)^n(1+a)^{N-n} - K]^+ \\ &= S_0 \textstyle\sum_{n=\tau}^{N} \frac{N!}{n!(N-n)!} q^n (1-q)^{N-n} \frac{(1+b)^n(1+a)^{N-n}}{(1+r)^N} \\ &\quad -K(1+r)^{-N} \textstyle\sum_{n=\tau}^{N} \frac{N!}{n!(N-n)!} q^n (1-q)^{N-n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $q = \frac{r-a}{b-a}$, and τ is the first integer n for which

$$S_0(1+b)^n(1+a)^{N-n} > K.$$

Now observe that using $q = \frac{r-a}{b-a}$ and

$$q' = q\frac{1+b}{1+r}$$

we obtain $0 < q' < 1$ so that we can finally write the fair price for the European call option in this multi-period quantum binomial pricing model as

$$C_0^N = S_0\Psi(\tau; N, q') - K(1+r)^{-N}\Psi(\tau; N, q), \tag{14}$$

which is the well-known *Cox-Ross-Rubinstein binomial option pricing formula* for the European call. Here Ψ is the complementary binomial distribution function, that is,

$$\Psi(m; n, p) = \sum_{j=m}^{n} \frac{n!}{j!(n-j)!} p^j (1-p)^{n-j}.$$

We would like to point out that the N-period quantum binomial market can be physically realized by the system of N distinguishable particles whose statistics are described by $((\mathbf{C}^2)^{\otimes N}, \{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n=0}^{N})$, where $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathbf{C}I_N$, and

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \mathcal{B}((\mathbf{C}^2)^{\otimes n}) \otimes I_{N-n} = \{B \otimes I_{N-n} : B \in \mathcal{B}((\mathbf{C}^2)^{\otimes n})\}$$

for $n = 1, ..., N$. We will discuss this naturally physical realization of the N-period quantum binomial market in a forthcoming paper.

5. Conclusions

We transfer methods of quantum mechanics to concepts used in Mathematical Finance. The quantum theory for arbitrage, asset pricing, and optional decomposition in financial markets based on finite dimensional quantum probability spaces is presented. To reveal what features of real-world financial markets are captured by the quantum model of the financial markets, we have studied the quantum model of the binomial markets. It was shown that the quantum binomial model could cease to pose the paradox which appears when pricing an option in the classical random model of the binomial markets. From this one could conclude that the quantum model of a financial market is much more suited to real-world financial markets rather than the classical one. Moreover, since the classical random model is not appropriate for the binomial markets, we re-deduce the Cox-Ross-Rubinstein binomial option pricing formula by using multi-period quantum binomial markets.

Acknowledgment

The author is very grateful to Professor Dr. D.Sondermann for useful advice and comments. Some parts of §4 were at his suggestion.

REFERENCES

B00 L.Bachelier, Théorie de la spéculation, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.,* 17, 21-86 (1900). English translation in: *The Random Character of Stock Market Prices,* P.Cootner ed., Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1964, pp 17-78

BS73 F.Black, M.Scholes, The pricing of options and corporate liabilities, *J. Political Econ.,* 81, 637-659 (1973)

Ch1 Zeqian Chen, A non-commutative version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing, *Preprint* (www.arxiv.org/quant-ph/0112159)

Ch2 Zeqian Chen, Quantum theory for the binomial model in finance theory, *Preprint* (www.arxiv.org/quant-ph/0112156v5)

Co94 A.Connes, *Noncommutative geometry,* San Diego: Academic Press, Inc., 1994

CRR79 J.C.Cox, S.A.Ross, M.Rubinstein, Option pricing: A simplified approach, *J. Finance Econ.,* 7, 229-263 (1979)

CR85 J.C.Cox, M.Rubinstein, *Options markets,* Prentice Hall: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1985

DMW90 R.C.Dalang, A.Morton, W.Willinger, Equivalent martingale measures and no-arbitrage in stochastic securities market model, *Stochastics Stoch. Rep.,* 29, 185-201 (1990)

Da76 R.Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976

DS94 F.Delbaen, W.Schachermayer, A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing, *Math. Ann.,* 300, 463-520 (1994)

DS98 F.Delbaen, W.Schachermayer, The fundamental theorem of asset pricing for unbounded stochastic processes, *Math. Ann.,* 312, 215-250 (1998)

DS01 F.Delbaen, W.Schachermayer, Applications to mathematical finance, In: *Handbook of the Geometry of Banach Spaces,* W.B.Johnson and J.Lindenstrauss, eds., Amsterdam: Elsevier Science B.V., 2001, pp 367-391

Du93 D.Duffie, *Dynamic Asset Pricing Theory,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993

DH86 D.Duffie, C.F.Huang, Multiperiod security markets with differential information: martingales and resolution times, *J. Math. Econom.,* 15, 283-303 (1986)

EW00 J.Eisert, M.Wilkens, Quantum games, *J. Mod. Opt.,* 47, 2543-2555 (2000)

EWL99 J.Eisert, M.Wilkens, M.Lewenstein, Quantum games and quantum strategies, *Phys. Rev. Lett.,* 83, 3077-3800 (1999)

EK99 R.Elliott, P.E.Kopp, *Mathematics of Financial Markets,* New York: Springer-Verlag, 1999

HK79 J.M.Harrison, D.M.Kreps, Martingales and arbitrage in multiperiod securities markets, *J. Econ. Theory,* 20, 381-408 (1979)

HP81 J.M.Harrison, S.R.Pliska, Martingales and stochastic interfrals in the theory of continuous trading, *Stoch. Proc. Appl.,* 11, 215-260 (1981)

Hu00 J.C.Hull, *Options, Futures and Other Derivatives,* 4th Edition, Prentice Hall: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 2000

KLS87 I.Karatzas, J.P.Lehoczky, S.E.Shreve, Optimal portfolio and consumption decisions for a "small investor" on a finite horizon, *SIAM J. Control and Optimi.,* 25, 1557-1586 (1987)

K96 D.Kramkov, Optional decomposition of supermartingales and hedging contingent claims in incomplete security markets, *Probab. Theory Related Fields,* 105, 459-479 (1996)

Kr81 D.M.Kreps, Arbitrage and equilibrium in economies with infinitely many commodities, *J. Math. Econ.,* 8, 15-35 (1981)

Me73 R.C.Merton, Theory of rational option pricing, *Bell J. Econ. Manag. Sci.,* 4, 141-183 (1973)

Me90 R.C.Merton, *Continuous-time Finance,* Basil: Black-Well, 1990

Mr99 D.A.Meyer, Quantum strategies, *Phys. Rev. Lett.,* 82, 1052-1055 (1999)

My93 P.A.Meyer, *Quantum Probability for Probabilists,* Lecture Notes in Math., 1426, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1993

vN55 J.von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955

P92 K.R.Parthasarathy, *An Introduction to Quantum Stochastic Calculus,* Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag 1992

PX97 G.Pisier, Q.Xu, Non-commutative martingale inequalities, *Comm. Math. Physics,* 189, 667-698 (1997)

S65 P.A.Samuelson, Proof that properly anticipated prices fluctuate randomly, *Industrial Manage. Review,* 6, 42-49 (1965)

Sc01 W.Schachermayer, Introduction to the Mathematics of Financial Markets, to appear in *Lecture Notes in Math.,* (St. Flour summer school 2000)

Sch66 H.H.Schäfer, *Topological Vector Spaces,* Berlin: Springer-Verlag 1966

Sh99 A.N.Shiryaev, *Essentials of Stochastic Finance* $(Facts, Models, Theory)$, Singapore: World Scientific, 1999

St90 C.Stricker, Arbitrage et lois de martingale, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré, Probab. Statist.,* 26, 451-460 (1990)

Ta72 M.Takesaki, Conditional expectations in von Neumann algebras, *J. Funct. Anal.,* 9, 306-321 (1972)

Ta01 M.Takesaki, *Theory of Operator Algebras I,* New York: Springer, 2001